

EXHIBIT 1

THREE-WAY COMPARISON BETWEEN THE INFRINGING PRODUCTS, THE PATENTS-IN-ISSUE AND THE PURPORTED CLOSEST PRIOR ART.

I. The 'D723 Patent Compares To Gyroor Products A Through D

Table 1-1: Comparison of the 'D723 Patent to the Gyroor Products A through D, in View of the 'D906 Patent




FIG. 1



Gyroor Product A¹



Gyroor Product B²



Gyroor Product C³



Gyroor Product D⁴




FIG. 3 of the prior art ('D906 Patent)

¹ Sold by at least Defendants: Gyroor (Gyroor.com; gyroorboard.com); Gaodeshang-US; Gyroshoes; HGSM; Urbanmax; Jiangyou-US; Gyroor-US

² Sold by at least Defendants: Gyroor (Gyroor.com; gyroorboard.com); Gaodeshang-US;

³ Sold by at least Defendants: Gyroor-US, Jiangyou-US; and Gyroor (Gyroor.com; gyroorboard.com);

⁴ Sold by at least Defendants Fengchi-US; Gyroor (Gyroor.com; gyroorboard.com);

Table 1-2: Comparison of the 'D723 Patent to the Gyroor Products A through D, in View of the 'D906 Patent






Table 1-3: Comparison of the 'D723 Patent to the Gyroor Products A through D, in View of the 'D906 Patent




FIG. 2 of the 'D723 patent



Gyroor Product A



Gyroor Product B



Gyroor Product C



Gyroor Product D




FIG. 3 of the prior art ('D906 Patent)

Table 1-4: Comparison of the 'D723 Patent to the Gyroor Products A through D, in View of the 'D906 Patent






Table 1-5: Comparison of the 'D723 Patent to the Gyroor Products A through D, in View of the 'D906 Patent




FIG. 5 of the 'D723 patent



Gyroor Product A



Gyroor Product B



Gyroor Product C



Gyroor Product D




FIG. 5 of the prior art ('D906 Patent)

In the eyes of the ordinary observer, the claimed design of the '723 is substantially the same as the overall visual impression presented by the Accused Products. Unlike the '906 Patent, the claimed design of the '723 Patent and the Accused Products share the same overall impression and have an integrated 'hourglass' body with a relatively flat surface across the top of the main body, arched covers over the wheel area, larger radii on the front and back of the underside, and elongated light panels on the front surface.

In the eyes of the ordinary observer, the claimed design of the '723 is substantially the same as the visual impression presented by the Accused Products. Also, the Accused Products are closer to the claimed design of the '723 Patent than to the '906 Patent.

II. The 'D256 Patent Compares To Gyroor Products A Through D

Table 2-1: Comparison of the 'D256 Patent to the Gyroor Products A through D, in View of the 'D906 Patent







	
FIG. 1 of the 'D256 patent	
	
Gyroor Product A	Gyroor Product B
	
Gyroor Product C	Gyroor Product D
	
FIG. 3 of the prior art ('D906 Patent)	

Table 2-2: Comparison of the 'D256 Patent to the Gyroor Products A through D, in View of the 'D906 Patent




FIG. 3 of the 'D256 patent



Gyroor Product A



Gyroor Product B



Gyroor Product C



Gyroor Product D




FIG. 2 of the prior art ('D906 Patent)

Table 2-3: Comparison of the 'D256 Patent to the Gyroor Products A through D, in View of the 'D906 Patent




FIG. 2 of the 'D256 patent



Gyroor Product A



Gyroor Product B



Gyroor Product C



Gyroor Product D




FIG. 3 of the prior art ('D906 Patent)

Table 2-4: Comparison of the 'D256 Patent to the Gyroor Products A through D, in View of the 'D906 Patent




FIG. 6 of the 'D256 patent



Gyroor Product A



Gyroor Product B



Gyroor Product C



Gyroor Product D




FIG. 4 of the prior art ('D906 Patent)

Table 2-5: Comparison of the 'D256 Patent to the Gyroor Products A through D, in View of the 'D906 Patent




FIG. 5 of the 'D256 patent



Gyroor Product A



Gyroor Product B



Gyroor Product C



Gyroor Product D




FIG. 5 of the prior art ('D906 Patent)

In the eyes of the ordinary observer, the claimed design of the '256 is substantially the same as the overall visual impression presented by the Accused Products. Unlike the '906 Patent, the claimed design of the '256 Patent and the Accused Products share the same overall impression

and have an integrated 'hourglass' body with a relatively flat surface across the top of the main body, arched covers over the wheel area, larger radii on the front and back of the underside, and elongated light panels on the front surface.

In the eyes of the ordinary observer, the claimed design of the '256 is substantially the same as the visual impression presented by the Accused Products. Also, the Accused Products are closer to the claimed design of the '256 Patent than to the '906 Patent.

III. The 'D195 Patent Compares To Gyroor Products A Through D

Table 3-1: Comparison of the 'D195 Patent to the Gyroor Products A through D, in View of the 'D906 Patent




FIG. 1 of the 'D195 patent



Gyroor Product A



Gyroor Product B



Gyroor Product C



Gyroor Product D




FIG. 3 of the prior art ('D906 Patent)

Table 3-2: Comparison of the 'D195 Patent to the Gyroor Products A through D, in View of the 'D906 Patent




FIG. 3 of the 'D195 patent



Gyroor Product A



Gyroor Product B



Gyroor Product C



Gyroor Product D




FIG. 2 of the prior art ('D906 Patent)

Table 3-3: Comparison of the 'D195 Patent to the Gyroor Products A through D, in View of the 'D906 Patent




FIG. 2 of the 'D195 patent



Gyroor Product A



Gyroor Product B



Gyroor Product C



Gyroor Product D




FIG. 3 of the prior art ('D906 Patent)

Table 3-4: Comparison of the 'D195 Patent to the Gyroor Products A through D, in View of the 'D906 Patent




FIG. 6 of the 'D195 patent



Gyroor Product A



Gyroor Product B



Gyroor Product C



Gyroor Product D




FIG. 4 of the prior art ('D906 Patent)

Table 3-5: Comparison of the 'D195 Patent to the Gyroor Products A through D, in View of the 'D906 Patent




FIG. 5 of the 'D195 patent



Gyroor Product A



Gyroor Product B



Gyroor Product C



Gyroor Product D




FIG. 5 of the prior art ('D906 Patent)

In the eyes of the ordinary observer, the claimed design of the '195 is substantially the same as the overall visual impression presented by the Accused Products. Unlike the '906 Patent, the claimed design of the '195 Patent and the Accused Products share an integrated 'hourglass' body with many horizontal styling lines across the body and a relatively flat surface across the

top, arched covers over the wheel area, larger radii on the front and back of the underside. Unlike any of the prior art the foot plates narrow as they extend toward the center.

In the eyes of the ordinary observer, the claimed design of the '195 is also substantially the same as the visual impression presented by the Accused Products. Also, the Accused Products are closer to the claimed design of the '195 Patent than to the '906 Patent.

IV. The 'D112 Patent Compares To Gyroor Products B And D

Table 4-1: Comparison of the 'D112 Patent to the Gyroor Products B and D, in View of the 'D906 Patent




FIG. 1 of the 'D112 patent



Gyroor Product B



Gyroor Product D




FIG. 3 of the prior art ('D906 Patent)

Table 4-2: Comparison of the 'D112 Patent to the Gyroor Products B and D, in View of the 'D906 Patent




FIG. 3 of the 'D112 patent



Gyroor Product B



Gyroor Product D




FIG. 2 of the prior art ('D906 Patent)

Table 4-3: Comparison of the 'D112 Patent to the Gyroor Products B and D, in View of the 'D906 Patent




FIG. 2 of the 'D112 patent



Gyroor Product B



Gyroor Product D




FIG. 3 of the prior art ('D906 Patent)

Table 4-4: Comparison of the 'D112 Patent to the Gyroor Products B and D, in View of the 'D906 Patent




FIG.6

FIG. 6 of the 'D112 patent



Gyroor Product B



Gyroor Product D




FIG. 4 of the prior art ('D906 Patent)

Table 5-5: Comparison of the 'D112 Patent to the Gyroor Products B and D, in View of the 'D906 Patent




FIG. 5 of the 'D112 patent



Gyroor Product B



Gyroor Product D




FIG. 5 of the prior art ('D906 Patent)

In the eyes of the ordinary observer, the claimed design of the '112 is substantially the same as the overall visual impression presented by the Accused Products. Unlike the '906 Patent, the claimed design of the '112 Patent and the Accused Products share an integrated 'hourglass' body with many lines angling across the body and a relatively flat surface across the top, arched

covers over the wheel area, larger radii on the front and back of the underside. Unlike any of the prior art the foot plates stretch across almost the full width of main body.

In the eyes of the ordinary observer, the claimed design of the '112 is also substantially the same as the visual impression presented by the Accused Products Gyroor B and Gyroor D, which are also closer to the claimed design of the '112 Patent than to the cited prior art of the '112 Patent.